

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Rashawn Alexander Grove,	)	C/A No. 6:23-cv-02491-JD
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b>ORDER AND OPINION</b>
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
Bryan K. Byrd, Kayleen Paterson, Director	)	
Neil Johnson, Lt. Brittany Keefner,	)	
Georgetown Police Department, Carter	)	
Weaver, Shirley Anderson,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

Plaintiff, a pretrial detainee proceeding *pro se*, brought this action seeking damages pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (DE 1.) In signing the Complaint, Plaintiff acknowledged that he was responsible for notifying the Clerk in writing of any change of address and that failure to keep his address updated with the Court may lead to dismissal of the case. (DE 1, p. 15.) By Order filed June 16, 2023, Plaintiff was informed that his case was not in proper form for service, and he was provided instructions on how to bring it into the proper form. (DE 7.) The Order warned Plaintiff that failure to provide the necessary information and paperwork within the timetable set in the Order may subject the case to dismissal. (DE 7, p. 1.) The Order also reminded Plaintiff to notify the clerk in writing of any change of address and warned that failure to keep his address updated with the Court may lead to dismissal of the case. (DE 1, p. 2.) Plaintiff did not respond to the Order, so on July 13, 2023, Plaintiff was given an additional opportunity to bring the case into proper form for judicial screening. (DE 9.) Plaintiff was warned a second time that failure to provide the necessary information and paperwork within the timetable set in the Order may subject the case to dismissal. (DE 9, p. 1.) The Order again reminded Plaintiff to notify the clerk in writing of any change of address and warned that failure to keep his address updated with the Court

may lead to dismissal of the case. (DE 9, p. 2.) On July 31, 2023, the Order dated July 13, 2023, was returned to the Court as undeliverable mail and stamped, “Return to Sender. Undeliverable as Addressed. Unable to Forward.” (DE 12, p. 1.) The envelope was also stamped “Return to Sender. (No longer at this facility).” (DE 12, p. 1.) To this date, Plaintiff has neither advised the Court of any changes to his address or responded to the second Proper Form Order, and the time for response has lapsed.

Plaintiff has failed to prosecute this case and has failed to comply with an Order of this Court. Accordingly, the case is DISMISSED, without prejudice, in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 41. See Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626 (1962).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

S/ Joseph Dawson, III  
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina  
August 1, 2023

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.